

many causes for deep concern felt by millions of Americans.

We have seen our military leaders and high civilians in the administration involved in contradictions about the value of continuing escalation of the conflict in Southeast Asia.

Then, just a few days ago, we heard from the President himself a reasonable argument in favor of a cessation of bombing in North Vietnam and an end to escalation—only to hear him turn that argument into an unreasonable conclusion in favor of continuing all-out military action with its attendant dangers of bringing new combatants into the war.

The President, you recall, said:

We recognize and always have recognized that there can be no military solution to the problems of Southeast Asia.

Then, twisting that thought in an incomprehensible U-turn, he concluded:

Only military power can bar aggression and make political solution possible.

A little over a month ago, the Secretary of Defense testified before a preparedness subcommittee in the other body that he had no reason to believe that North Vietnam "can be bombed to the negotiating table."

Mr. Speaker, I simply ask this: If there can be no military solution, and if bombing cannot bring a political solution, then why in the name of reason and humanity do we not only continue bombing, but expand it to greater extremes?

From the reactions to bombing pauses, frequent peace feelers, invitations directly to Hanoi and through assorted third parties, it has become apparent that Ho Chi Minh will not come to the conference table while our bombing continues.

Yet, the President has admitted that bringing him to the conference table is our basic aim. I hope that this final clarification of our objective does not come too late. It may well be that our Government's failure to put full emphasis on this purpose may already have put a political solution out of reach. Surely, a continuation of our misguided efforts cannot make it easier to reach.

Nobody in the free world can seriously doubt our purpose for being in Vietnam. We are there to protect a society of freedom from a threat of enslavement. Yet, by our misdirection, we may be destroying the very society we are determined to save.

There can be little doubt that the people of Vietnam want peace. Who can say that any men, women, and children who have undergone the pain, destruction, and chaos of war for so many years can want anything but to end it?

We must maintain the conviction among the people of Vietnam that our purpose is to end the death and destruction, and to bring peace and freedom to their land. If we cannot do this, then we risk the result of seeing the people we are trying to save rushing blindly to enslavement because they have lost faith in the reasonableness of our aims and purposes.

We must not risk the chance that whatever we may win in Vietnam, we will

lose the war by losing the people to those against whom we are waging a bloody, costly conflict.

Certainly, a first step toward achievement of any part of our goal is to put an immediate halt to further escalation. But that is only a first step, and it is surely not enough, for without second and third steps, it is an effort toward continuing a status quo which we cannot accept indefinitely, and which the people of Vietnam certainly do not want.

I am strongly convinced by all that has been said—by both the hawks and the doves, by the administration and its opponents—that there remains but one possible course of action if we are to achieve our good purpose in Vietnam.

We must do whatever has to be done to bring the only possible solution—a political solution—closer, if we are ever to hope for a just and honorable peace, and an end to the bloodletting and destruction.

We know that bombing "pauses" won't work, because they are outright invitations to the adversaries to hurry more supplies and more infiltrators, in preparation for the resumption guaranteed by the very idea of a "pause."

We know that invitations, urgings, and dares to negotiation, while the bombers continue to roar over Haiphong, can have little result, and no gain.

We now have one course open to us, and I am convinced that if we do not take it at once, we can gain little but risk a great deal. We must cease all bombing of North Vietnam at once.

The President should immediately announce a date on which such bombing will cease completely. His announcement must not be merely an intention of halting the bombing, nor a vague statement of purpose. He should state it in no uncertain terms—the date, hour, and minute on which all bombing of the North will stop.

I have repeatedly spoken on this floor during the past year or more to urge the administration to take such a step. I have also appealed directly to the President for such specific action.

For example, on September 22, 1966, in the second session of the 89th Congress, I said this:

The President has repeatedly made clear the Nation's basic commitment to peace. But, unfortunately, these well-intentioned expressions have not been convincing to the other combatants and much of the non-aligned world.

That is why I feel that instead of constantly repeating our general willingness to negotiate at any time and anywhere, we should set forth a format in specific terms. In effect, the United States would seize the initiative in a very dramatic way, challenging the other belligerents to lay down their arms and confer at a stated time and place.

The President should set a specific date, time and place for peace talks. At the same time, he should dispatch invitations to all interested parties, including the National Liberation Front, and announce a cessation of bombing to take effect 24 hours in advance of the conference.

I still see this as the only means of bringing about a direct confrontation. Let us place Ho Chi Minh in the position of having to "put up or shut up." With the bombing ended, there can be no other

steps but those leading to the conference table.

At the same time, we must recast our military approach in the south, aiming toward a concentration of our power to secure the coastal areas and population centers where a vast majority of the people live. Let us draw in our troops to stronger defensive positions, protecting friendly enclaves. This would result in a substantial reduction of American troop strength, and greater security for most of the people of South Vietnam.

We must end the costly search-and-destroy missions, which have gained little, and concentrate our influence on the Saigon government to bring to its people now—and not at some distant time of hoped-for peace—the reforms and improvements in living conditions they need and deserve.

Eventually, the only real peace in Vietnam can come through understandings among all of the peoples of Southeast Asia. Peace cannot be permanently negotiated from the outside, not even by great powers. The people of North and South Vietnam, of Laos, and Cambodia, of all of the involved nations of Southeast Asia must come to mutual understandings. This we must stress in using our influence on Saigon.

As for the peace talks themselves, if they finally come about, let us have less concern for protocol and more for achievement. If there can be no immediate confrontation between the United States and Ho Chi Minh, then let us have a meeting of neutral nations as a forerunner to real peace talks. Ho would then have no choice but to move toward peace.

Let us by any means, and by all means open to us, strive toward the goal of ending the death and bloodletting, and establishing a peace of honor and justice. This is our stated purpose; let it be the only guideline for purposeful action to bring it about.

NE
UNITED STATES SHOULD REVISE ITS MIDDLE EAST POLICY: PARTICULARLY THE POLICY OF RESTRICTING ARMS SALES TO ISRAEL.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to preface my remarks by saying that I do not pretend to be an expert on the Middle East or on American policy toward the Arab States and Israel. I nevertheless feel compelled to make some observations on U.S. policy in that part of the world.

Last month I had an opportunity, as a member of the House Armed Services Committee, to visit Israel and the Israel-occupied sectors of Syria and Jordan. If I were asked to recall one central, lasting impression of my trip, I would say that it is the remarkable spirit of the Israeli people. I need not remind my distinguished colleagues of Israel's accomplishments since her birth as a nation only two decades ago. Were we to list and describe them all, we could prob-

October 4, 1967

H 12968

ably fill many volumes of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

My speech today, however, is not a salute to Israel. It is instead a challenge to those who formulate our Middle East policy, to those who execute that policy, and to Members of Congress, who, under our Constitution, are charged with the responsibility of overseeing our foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, I find myself in agreement with Theodore Draper of Yale, who in the August issue of Commentary, argued that the recent Arab-Israeli war clearly demonstrated the utter "bankruptcy" of our policy in the Middle East.

The American people were generally delighted with Israel's lightning military victory. They were also relieved by the outcome. I say "relieved" because thoughtful Americans realized that their Government had virtually no leverage, either political or military, over the situation. It became apparent to all that the administration was neither willing nor able to come to the defense of America's only true ally in the Middle East. A combination of forces, notably a disproportionate commitment in Vietnam and a counterproductive Middle East policy, drastically curtailed our options. In addition, it can be argued that our policy of supplying vast quantities of military aid to the Arabs—while denying Israel the opportunity to buy American-made military equipment—contributed to the outbreak of hostilities.

There is a tendency, I think, to overlook this tragic failure of American policy because of the Israel victory. Most people say, "Everything turned out all right for the United States, didn't it?" At the risk of shattering our euphoria, I would like to remind my colleagues of the administration's confusion and indecision during those days of crisis in May and June. I would like to remind my colleagues of the foot-dragging at the White House and the verbal gyrations at the State Department. I would like to remind my colleagues of the diplomatic circus in Cairo, where our Ambassador, when asked about the impending crisis, replied—as quoted in the Washington Star and the Baltimore Sun, June 15:

What crisis? There is no crisis in the Middle East. This thing will not amount to much.

I am not searching for a scapegoat, although several names do come to mind. Individuals are not solely responsible for an inadequate foreign policy. Our failure in the Middle East stems from an all-too-familiar cycle. A policy is conceived, implemented, and perpetuated despite changing conditions and in spite of calls for realism and reappraisal. The policy acquires a momentum of its own and soon the policymakers become the captives of the policy. The policy, by now not consistent with and probably contrary to America's best interests, traps us by limiting us to a few equally distasteful alternatives.

Our policy toward the Middle East has been two-headed from the start. In his memoirs, President Harry S. Truman pointedly explains that on the question of Israel, the State Department was "more concerned about the Arab reaction

than the sufferings of the Jews." He cites memorandums from the State Department which indicate that Foggy Bottom was preoccupied with thoughts of Arab oil. According to President Truman:

The State Department's specialists on the Near East were, almost without exception, unfriendly to the idea of a Jewish state.

Mr. Truman summarizes State Department policy as follows:

Their thinking went along this line: Great Britain has maintained her position in the area by cultivating the Arabs; now that she seems to no longer be able to hold this position, the United States must take over, and it must be done by exactly the same formula; if the Arabs are antagonized, they will go over into the Soviet Camp. (Emphasis mine.)

Well, we have been very careful not to antagonize the Arabs. We have given them substantial economic and military aid. And yet today the Arabs stand squarely in the Soviet camp. Because of foggy thinking at Foggy Bottom, this "policy" of ours has cost the American taxpayer billions of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has given over \$1 billion to Egypt and over one-half billion dollars to Jordan in the past two decades. These estimates, of course, do not include Central Intelligence Agency aid to the Arabs, which, I understand, has been substantial. What is worse, we have been suckered into providing massive military aid to Jordan. According to the New York Times of January 26, American dollars have permitted King Hussein—who at this very hour is in Moscow soliciting Soviet aid—to increase his army from 4,000 men in 1948 to 55,000 men today. Thanks to American largesse, Hussein now has a \$56 million defense budget, and before the war had 11 infantry brigades, five fighter squadrons, and about 300 modern tanks—250 of which were American-made Patton T-48's.

Our policy toward Jordan was designed to make her strong and self-sufficient. But this belief, so dearly held at State, was shattered by recent events. When the chips were down, Jordan declared war on Israel and broke diplomatic relations with us. Americans had to watch the spectacle of Jordan, armed to the teeth with American weapons, waging war against our best friend in the Middle East. Jordan's Patton tanks went up in flames, and so did U.S. foreign policy.

I have already alluded to the chaos in Cairo and State Department Press Officer Robert McCloskey's unbelievable comment that the United States was "neutral in thought, word, and deed." Even more alarming, however, was the administration's failure to state precisely this Nation's position. The White House was quick to disassociate itself from the McCloskey fiasco, but no forthright statement was issued. A major war was raging in the Middle East, but our leaders were silent. According to Theodore Draper, U.S. officials were not at all sure what our commitment to Israel was. Mr. Draper claims that the administration had to telephone former President Eisenhower to determine the nature of the commitment.

The fact of the matter is that our commitment to Israel is clear and long-

standing. The Eisenhower administration persuaded Israel to withdraw from Sharm el-Sheikh in 1957 in return for a pledge that our 6th Fleet would, if necessary, come to her defense. Prime Minister Levi Eshkol dealt with this very point in an interview with U.S. News & World Report, April 17, 1967:

But I would surely expect such help, especially if I take into consideration all the solemn promises that have been made to Israel. We get these promises when we ask the United States for arms and are told: "Don't spend your money. We are here. The Sixth Fleet is here."

Prime Minister Eshkol's remarks lead me to still another criticism of our Middle East policy: namely the corollary policy of restricting arms sales to Israel. The latest example of this is the State Department's refusal to permit American firms to sell jet aircraft to Israel. The Israel Government is eager to purchase Skyhawk fighter-bombers from Douglas, but the State Department, which has already supplied Jordan with Lockheed F-104's, is dragging its feet, claiming that the whole question is under "intensive review."

American equipment makes up a very small fraction of Israel's military capability. The Israel Air Force is French, her tanks mainly British, and her small arms her own.

Mr. Speaker, in light of the French decision to end its support of the Israel Air Force, the Soviet program of re-equipping the Arabs with arms, and the British sale of Hunter jet fighters and other equipment to Jordan, I think it is imperative that we junk our policy of restricting arms sales to Israel. A good first step would be to approve the sale of Skyhawks. Israel is not begging for military aid; she is simply asking our Government to sanction arm's sales. If Israel cannot count on us, who can she count on?

Because of the favorable outcome of the recent Arab-Israeli war and our preoccupation with Southeast Asia, little has been said about our policy toward the Near East. What I have tried to do today is examine our strategy in that part of the world and the consequences of that policy.

Mr. Speaker, to use a favorite State Department cliché, the time has come for an "agonizing reappraisal" of our whole Middle East policy. And I think that the legislative branch should conduct its own thorough review of that policy.

THE HARD TRUTH ABOUT TRUTH IN LENDING

(Mr. HANNA (at the request of Mr. WALDIE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, distortions abound concerning the realities of the truth-in-lending legislation now being considered by the House Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs. The House of Representatives has a very specific responsibility to pass a meaningful credit disclosure measure this year, but in order to do so it must sort the fact from the

THE ARAB REFUGEES AND COMMUNIST HYPOCRISY

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. WALDIE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, blatant hypocrisy is nothing new in the Communist world, but their encouragement of the Arabs to continue to use the plight of refugees resulting from the conflicts in the Middle East as a political football is disgraceful. Most of the nations of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union are certainly among the worst offenders in creating refugees.

In case anyone has forgotten, Czechoslovakia expelled 3 million Germans from homes where they had lived for many generations when the Communists took over that country; Communist Poland expelled about 7 million Germans from Pomerania and Silesia. Similarly, Soviet Russia has long been known for its ruthless uprooting of peoples. One blatant example was their expelling of millions of Poles and Germans from the frontier areas in Eastern Prussia.

How can these countries now condemn Israel for not solving a problem which in the first instance is not one that Israel created? It must never be forgotten that those Arabs who have become refugees did so at the urging of their leaders. This is true of the Middle East war this year just as it was true of the war of 1948.

It is interesting to note that so far neither the Arab world nor the Communist world has done anything whatever to aid the Arab refugees, while Israel has now assumed the responsibility for most of them and invited those displaced by the 1967 war to return to their homes. This is, of course, at great risk to the internal security of Israel and clearly demonstrates its willingness to express its humaneness with deeds instead of words.

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. WALDIE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. MULTER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

ROSH HASHANA, 5728

(Mrs. KELLY (at the request of Mr. WALDIE) was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the festival of Rosh Hashana, the Jewish New Year, comes each year in September or October. This year it falls on October 5, and Orthodox and Conservative Jews observe the occasion for a 2-day period, October 5 and 6. This turning of the year is, for the Jewish people, a time of repentance, but not of sadness; a time of joyful worship and hopeful prayer. Typical of the spirit of this time is the pleasant custom, whose symbolism is plain to the youngest child, of eating an apple or other fruit dipped in honey, as a foretaste of the

sweetness hoped for in the coming year. To all my Jewish friends, to the Jewish people of all the world, and especially to the people of Israel, who are so triumphantly surviving a fierce and bitter test, I wish all the sweetness and happiness promised by this symbolic taste; and I join in the ancient prayer that God may hasten the time when all the people of the earth shall be brothers, and wickedness and tyranny shall pass away like smoke into the sky.

VICTORY FOR THE CITIES

(Mr. BARRETT (at the request of Mr. WALDIE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the press of the country has been loud in its praise of congressional action that looks to the establishment of meaningful model cities, rent supplements, and rat control programs. All of them are needed, and editorials in the New York Times and the Philadelphia Bulletin have urged favorable outcome for these programs which are considered essential for the health of our cities. So that my colleagues may know the content of the editorial, I insert them in the RECORD at this point:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 22, 1967]

VICTORY FOR THE CITIES

The Senate's votes in favor of adequate funds to start the model cities and rent subsidy programs add up to an important victory for the nation's cities. These two new programs are urgently needed if the nation is to make headway against the slums.

It is particularly encouraging that Senator Dirksen, the minority leader, and sixteen other Republicans voted for rent subsidies. Last year only five Republican Senators supported this program. If Representative Ford, the G.O.P. leader in the House, and his senior colleagues would similarly alter their position, the House conferees would have little difficulty accepting the amounts voted by the Senate.

The shift of more than forty House Republicans on the rat-control bill the other day helped get their party off the hook on what had proved to be an embarrassing vote. These changes of position on rent subsidies and rat control show that at least some Republicans recognize that in an increasingly urbanized nation there is no future for a party that turns its back on the harsh problems of the cities.

[From the Sunday Bulletin, Sept. 24, 1967]

SECOND THOUGHTS ON THE CITIES

The Congress these days is a fascinating study. The House is having what appears to be a latter-day attack of conscience. The Senate is doing what it can to remind the conservative coalition in the House of their collective responsibilities to the cities.

It was in May that the House conservatives—Republicans and Southern Democrats—fed President Johnson's \$662 million request for the Model Cities program into the shredder and came out with \$237 million. Then they went on to eliminate the \$40 million asked for rent supplements altogether.

Summer and the agony and uproar in the cities seemed to make little difference. It was toward the end of July that the House voted down the rat control bill amid derisive laughter and bad plays on words. The fact that the bill might not have been in the best possible form got scant attention or proposals for a better alternative.

The reaction was vivid. The cities have

protested bitterly against the violent amputation of Model Cities funds and destruction of rent supplements. On rat control, President Johnson called the House action a "cruel blow to the poor children," and 112 private organizations, in a joint declaration, said it was "an act of shocking irresponsibility."

The reaction, evidently, has been effective. And it is some comfort that it is being acted upon. The House, on sober and reflective second thought, has now reversed itself on the rat bill, this time putting more control over spending the \$40 million in local hands. But that should not hurt, provided the cities diligently ensure that the funds do, indeed, go for rat extermination.

The second thoughts in the House did not extend to restoration of the Model Cities and rent supplement funds.

But the Senate may accomplish this. It has now voted \$537 million for the cities bill and the full \$40 million asked for the rent measure. And if the House members of the Senate-House conference committee still have the ear they have lately turned attuned to urban noises, the story may yet have a happy and constructive ending.

NEW YORK TIMES APPLAUDS PRESIDENT'S SELECTION OF WASHINGTON CITY COUNCIL

(Mr. ROSENTHAL (at the request of Mr. WALDIE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has named a distinguished City Council to assist Mayor Walter Washington in governing our Capital City.

This capable group of dedicated Washingtonians will, in the words of a New York Times editorial, "win the confidence of Congress" and the entire country.

As the editorial notes, President Johnson's thoughtful selection is another step in the dawn of a new era in Washington government. With the President's modernization of the District's antiquated governmental structure, his proposal for an elected school board, and the possibility of congressional representation, the District is, in President Johnson's phrase, emerging "into the world of 20th century government."

I join the New York Times in praising the administration's selection of Council members for our Nation's Capital. Their choice gives pride to Washington and to the Nation.

I include the New York Times editorial of September 29 in the RECORD at this point:

[From the New York Times, Friday, September 29, 1967]

... AND PROGRESS IN WASHINGTON

President Johnson has appointed nine capable, well-qualified citizens to serve on the new City Council to run the municipal government of Washington, D.C. He has suitably recognized the Negro majority in the city by choosing Negroes for five of the nine places.

The avowedly militant Negroes are disappointed that President Johnson did not select one of them for the council. But if home rule is ever to become a reality, the new board's primary task is to win the confidence of Congress and of elements of the business community that have resisted self-government in the District. For that reason, the President wisely decided to err on the side of caution.

October 4, 1967

Mrs. Nowlin is a good mother with a happy nature. She says her children are content with the little they have and she even has to coax them to go to a movie once in a while.

"At night, I'm afraid," she confesses. "They have the girls on the street and the men—they call them pimps. Yes, I'm afraid. I don't go out."

On a table in her small, windowless living room is a set of encyclopedias she bought for the children to help with their school work. The family takes a weekly news magazine as well as a news picture magazine. These came as the result of daughter Amy's filling out coupons in one of the magazines.

"Amy's always sending off those coupons and we never know what will arrive next," laughed the indulgent mother.

There is no resentment of white people in the Nowlin home. If there's any fear it is for teenagers in the schools the children attend.

"Some of them carry weapons to school and my kids have never seen anything like that before."

Mrs. Nowlin, whose dream is to own her own home in a nice neighborhood and see her children educated, has her heroes in both the Negro and white races.

"Booker T. Washington is the Negro leader I love. . . always wrote my essays at school about him. Great living men, I'd say, are the Rev. Howard and Dr. Martin Luther King.

"And then the Kennedy family. I really love them. All of them. I read everything I can get my hands on about them."

Mrs. Marian Burton, now retired after a brilliant career in social work—Juvenile Court was her last assignment—wonders how any Negro person today can be complacent, can say he is satisfied with what the Negro is offered.

She really boils at the thought.

She is downtown daily at the City-County Building or attending various civic meetings to protest injustices against the Negro, to fight for the oppressed.

She's one of 21 directors of the Virginia Park Redevelopment Committee determined that when 12th Street is built up once again, after this recent riots, it won't be a promenade of saloons, pawn shops, cheap furniture stores and gouging grocery stores.

A devoted follower of the Rev. Albert B. Cleage Jr., and a tireless worker in his Central United Church of Christ, Mrs. Burton seems to favor the philosophy of the Black Nationalists group. However she does not belong to any particular sect except for a "small membership" she holds in NAACP.

A widow, she lives in a comfortable upstairs flat on Virginia Park, the silken traditional furniture plumped to the nth degree with down pillows.

With her are her son, William E. Poole, a widower, and her granddaughter, Ernestine, 23, "the love" of her life.

"There's a photograph of Ernestine over there," said Mrs. Burton the other day as she sat in her pretty living room. "She was hired at the Children's Hospital on the telephone."

"I took her there myself. As you can see she's a dark girl and when she walked in the hospital people said, 'Are you Ernestine Poole?' She said she was and that she was reporting for work. 'Well, we don't have any openings,' they said.

"So when we talk about racial problems and the numerous insults we have to take in the course of a day—not for any reason except that we are black—this, I say, is why people rebel as Negroes now are doing.

"During my generation I think Negroes were more accepting of the situation, didn't do anything to correct it.

"But in my own social work for instance I've had fellow Negro social workers say, 'Why do you work with those people?' meaning the disadvantaged of our race. They told me to get smart and not to talk so much.

"But I've always worked for the underprivileged and I will until I die."

Mrs. Burton, a graduate of Butler College and Wayne State where she received her B.A. in sociology, has worked for the underprivileged white, too. With little thanks, she adds.

She remembers one white family in particular who live in a filthy hovel and whose daughter didn't have clothes to wear to school. As a welfare worker, at the time, Mrs. Burton saw that the girl got clothes and urged her to bathe and keep herself neat and clean.

Not long after that she called at the home and the parents told her they had sent their daughter down South to go to school.

"We didn't want her going to school here with niggers," they announced.

She scorns all politicians, feeling they have used her people to reach office and then failed them by doing nothing to give the Negro full citizenship.

A lot of Negroes don't vote, saying, "Why should we?—the white people are going to do what they want anyhow."

But this isn't the attitude Mrs. Burton takes. She's urging and organizing Negroes to stick together, to take an interest in their governmental representatives.

"You can't call that hate," she says, "That survival."

Mrs. Burton says that her greatest ambition was to build a home for Negro working girls, girls who made such paltry salaries they couldn't afford a decent place to live.

"The meager salaries of the past have made girls stoop to prostitution and once they've started that, they're hooked."

But a Negro prostitute, Cele, munched on a midmorning hamburger in her home on the east side just a few days later and said she had chosen her profession because she "likes sex" and:

"Besides owning my own fully furnished home, I now have three TV sets, two black and white and a color set; clothes, furs and jewels.

"How else could I afford all this? Before I started walking the streets I worked with the Department of Parks and Recreation and after that was a clerk in a record shop."

Cele was born in Gloucester, Miss. She's 20 years old and the mother of a four-year-old son. She became pregnant in school, stayed out long enough to have her child and then went back but didn't graduate.

Her husband, 26, married her after the baby was born. They lived together six weeks and then separated.

"But he says I can come back whenever I want to," Cele said with assurance.

She says she makes from \$70 to \$120 a night on "her corner" and doesn't have trouble with the police when they arrest her because "I pay them the proper respect."

Some of the other girls use foul language and get themselves slapped around by the police, she adds.

She's been picked up for streetwalking about 25 times since she started a year ago. Her longest detention was 45 days in Detroit House of Correction where she got a chance to cook, which she enjoys.

Cele says her mother doesn't mind what she's doing; in fact she wished her well when she left home.

And she looked off into space a moment when asked what she hoped her four-year-old son would grow up to be.

Then, she answered, "Well, everybody says he's going to be either a preacher or a pimp."

She has no race hostilities.

However, the neat, bright-eyed girl in white uniform and the pert cap of a Harlem Hospital graduate nurse, Brenda Turner, 23, said, without too much rancor:

"I'm sure that somewhere there must be a lot of nice white people but I've never met them.

"I resent being called 'girl' instead of nurse when halled by white patients in the hos-

pital and as a Negro I know I have to be just a little better in everything I do than my white counterpart.

"Probably I could be a professor of nursing but I'd still first be a Negro in most hospitals."

This isn't necessarily true of the hospital where Brenda now works. In fact, she's had the satisfaction of having white doctors look down a line of nurses, many of whom were white, and select her for the job at hand.

"It isn't that I'm so great but the doctors here are more concerned with getting the job done than the color of a nurse's skin," she added.

Brenda's a native Detroit, her father is a DSR guard. When the family moved to a new home in the Northeast section of Detroit, white children on the block printed unpleasant words in the snow in front of their house.

While she respects the performances of Stokely Carmichael, H. Rap Brown and Rev. Cleage, Miss Turner also admires Martin Luther King, "the perfect example of a true Christian."

"The others," she said, "are more violent and perhaps violence is the way the Negro must take to win equality. You see we're not asking white people to love us or to live next door to us. We simply want full citizenship.

"I don't believe in separation, going back to Africa or living on a small strip of land off the coast of Mexico.

"I just want to buy the same home the white man can, at the same price he pays for it. I don't want to be gouged because I'm black."

She grew even more serious:

"I'm for Black Nationalism and Black Power but I'm even more for the Black Dollar. I think the black man should establish more businesses and employ black workers so we wouldn't be so dependent upon the white man.

"I also believe more in boycotts than riots. But I knew in my heart the riots would come to Detroit because of the dissatisfaction over housing, employment, police brutality.

"I won't say they were conducted in the right way with Negroes burning their own homes. If you are angry at the white man then it's the white man you should hurt."

She was asked if she didn't think laws should be respected by Negroes as well as white people.

"Laws? What laws?" was her response. "The white man has been making laws for hundreds of years that he doesn't enforce.

"We aren't about to kill people but the white man must realize that we're no longer content with talk. I also believe that the main responsibility in this present crisis falls on the Negro. I think my generation and my parents' generation must instill a pride of race in the generation now growing up.

"I am proud—terribly proud—to be a Negro. I wouldn't want to be white. The only time I ever, even momentarily, thought I might consider marrying a white man—for I'm more attracted to Negro men—was when I visited my cousin in New York.

"She's married to an Italian and he's one of the sweetest persons I've ever known. Because they are so happy together it made me wonder if I ever could."

But Miss Turner travels primarily in Negro society, having the occasional Coke and sandwich with a white intern or a fellow nurse from the hospital.

Tranquil — passionate — secure — unsure — friendly — hostile — patient — anxious — outspoken — reserved — intelligent and cultured — polite — rude — bitter — hopeful.

A study of the Negro woman's mystique reveals all these qualities.

Only in one way is she totally and historically different from her white sister who never wakes up mornings wondering what indignity she'll suffer this day because her skin is white.

the plane went into a stall and crashed in a canyon. The occupants were injured but alive. Searchers came within a mile of the crash but never spotted it. Dr. Lovelace, his wife, and their pilot were frozen to death 5 days after the crash.

I am sure my colleagues read press accounts of the tragic deaths of the Oien family of Oregon, whose light plane crashed on a northern California mountain last March. The family, which included a 16-year-old girl, survived the crash and managed to stay alive for 2 full months before succumbing to exposure and starvation. The young girl's diary told of the frustration they felt hearing search planes overhead—planes which could not see them because of bad weather and had no other means of pinpointing the crash site.

It is appalling to me that the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines have been using successfully for 3 full years a simple little device that would clearly have saved the Oiens and the Lovelaces, and countless others. This automatic crash locating unit, developed and manufactured by ACR Electronics Corp., of New York City, has already saved the lives of more than 1,000 aircrews who crashed in Vietnam. The military unit is inexpensive, costing only \$285 each. I understand that a similar unit could be adapted for civilian use for under \$100. Even if the cost were far higher, the price would be minimal in terms of the lives this device could save. The FAA must be aware of the use being made of it by the military. Yet, it takes no action. It continues to study.

Mr. Speaker, I am calling upon the FAA to immediately certify an automatic crash locator and to issue a regulation requiring its use on all commercial and private aircraft in the United States. The FAA is studying air safety to death—literally. It is time to stop studying and start acting.

NE file MILITARY DICTATORS ARE RUIN- ING GREECE

(Mr. FRASER (at the request of Mr. WALDIE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times magazine recently published a penetrating article about the terrible events occurring in Greece under the military officers who revolted and seized power last spring.

Dictatorship in its shabbiest dress now rules Greece, the land which gave birth to many of our most precious ideas of democracy and liberty. Surely our Nation and the other democracies of the West cannot consider doing business as usual with this band of men until constitutional government and freedom is restored.

I have unanimous consent to place in the RECORD the sad story of what this military junta is doing to the people and their freedoms in Greece.

The story follows:

AFTER THE ARRESTS—HOW THE MILITARY RULES 8 MILLION GREEKS

(By Maurice Goldbloom)

The military junta which seized power in Greece last April 21 is still nervous, but with

each passing day it is less and less vulnerable. By now, neither a decision by King Constantine to break with it, nor a decision by the United States to cut off military aid would automatically topple it, though either would undoubtedly weaken it.

The attitude of most Greeks toward the King's role is summed up in a mot that has been going the rounds in Athens: "In the process of seduction, there is a point at which a girl must decide whether she is going to remain a virgin. The King has passed that point with the junta." In his recent appearances in the United States—in Washington with the President, in Newport for the America's Cup races—Constantine has apparently been acting as the regime's envoy. For its part, the United States, through its initial acquiescence, has given the junta the time it needed to dig in.

In other words, the junta, though not noticeably more popular, does seem to be more solidly entrenched. The coup was staged by no more than 200 to 400 officers—out of some 10,000 in the Greek Army. The ability of such a small group to seize power without significant opposition was largely the result of mistaken identity. Greeks had long been expecting—and right-wing Greeks had been hoping for—a coup by a large, nominally secret, but in fact well-known, organization dominated by senior officers known as IDEA. But over the years a small, rival organization of junior officers, called EENA, had been growing up almost unnoticed. At the time of the coup its leadership included only one general—Stylianos Patakos, now Minister of the Interior—and he had been made a brigadier only three months before. The group's most important leader was Col. George Papadopoulos—who happened also to be the man assigned by IDEA to transmit the orders for its coup to its followers throughout the army.

It was EENA that struck, but when Papadopoulos gave the signal its recipients thought they were obeying IDEA. Because there was no organized democratic group in the army, there was no military resistance. Because civilian political groups—including the weak and demoralized Communists—were prepared only for electoral activity, there was no popular resistance.

Once in, the junta lost no time in broadening its base of military support. Increasing the officer corps by approximately 10 per cent has enabled it to win the support of perhaps twice that many officers through promotions and new appointments. Key officers on whose loyalty it could not count were forced to retire. In the army, this purge for the most part took place immediately after the coup; in the navy, where the coup had received almost no support, the junta moved more slowly. Still, by mid-August more than 60 naval officers, mostly of high rank, were said to have been removed, and 11 to have been arrested.

Arrests, indeed, have been the junta's most conspicuous activity. The cases of former Premier George Papandreou of the Center Union, his son, Andreas Papandreou, and Mikis Theodorakis, composer of the score for "Zorba the Greek," have attracted worldwide attention, but there are thousands more, and the arrests show no signs of abating.

The original wave of arrests was based largely on an army list of suspects prepared nearly 20 years ago; the conspirators had been afraid to ask for more recent lists for fear of tipping their hand. Thus, many of those arrested in the first sweep were people who, whatever they might have been in the turbulent nineteen-forties, had long since ceased to be politically active.

Later arrests—which by now certainly outnumber those of the first wave—have been more selective. They affect all sections of the political spectrum, including parliamentary deputies, former Government ministers and several of the country's leading journalists. They also include a man who criticized the

King in a telephone conversation with his sister, a bus driver who objected to letting a soldier ride free and numerous persons accused of such offenses as having five or more guests in their home or possessing a mimeograph and not registering it with the police.

Of those arrested at the time of the coup, more than 6,000 were sent to a hastily opened concentration camp on the island of Yiaros. (Some 1,500, most of whom had been arrested because of their official positions rather than for their politics, were soon released, though many remained under house arrest.) The Government has now announced the opening of a second major concentration camp on the island of Leros, to which prisoners are being transferred from Yiaros. This should be an improvement.

Yiaros is a completely waterless and barren island, swept by high winds. Before the coup it had an old and unused prison, with cells for a few hundred persons. When the detainees were dumped on the island, the prison was used to house some of the women. The other prisoners were housed in tents, 25 to a tent, grouped in three camps.

Some weeks later, at a time when the Government claimed to have released about a third of the prisoners originally there, it announced plans to construct reservoirs on the island which would make it possible for each prisoner to receive 15 liters (a little less than 4 gallons) of water a day. Clearly, the water supply during the first several weeks must have been barely enough for drinking, let alone sanitation.

Later, other ameliorations were promised. These included an improvement in the diet, which was said to have consisted mainly of beans, and the opening of a canteen at which prisoners could purchase additional food and other small necessities. Some of these improvements may have taken place. It at least appears reasonably certain that the canteen was opened—since underground channels reported a few weeks later that it had been closed again.

There are inevitable gaps and time lags in information on conditions in the various places of detention, since Yiaros and most of the others have been barred to journalists and foreigners. A representative of the International Red Cross has, to be sure, been permitted to visit them. But in accordance with the normal practice of that organization, his report was submitted only to the Greek Government, which never made it public.

The Government did, however, release a letter in which the Red Cross representative asked on humanitarian grounds that the 250 women confined in the old prison on Yiaros be transferred elsewhere, to accommodations more appropriate to their sex. (The circumstances of this release were such that one is impelled to wonder if the Government really desired to give it wide publicity. In the Greek Government press office, official releases are normally laid out on tables, arranged in the order of the numbers which they bear. They are available in Greek, English and French. This release had no number, it was not with the others, and it was available only in Greek.) I have seen no report indicating that such a transfer has in fact taken place, although the women may be among those now being moved to Leros.

If conditions on Yiaros have improved in some elementary physical respects, it appears that they have recently become worse in other ways. Some 250 of the "most dangerous" prisoners are said to have been segregated from the others, and to be confined to their quarters 20 hours a day. During the four hours in which they are allowed out, the other prisoners are confined, in order to prevent any contact between the two groups. And the three camps on the island are kept isolated from one another.

These changes probably result from the regime's disappointment at the failure of the

H 12984

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

October 4, 1967

prisoners to break down under its pressure. A condition for release is that the detainee sign a pledge to refrain from "antinationa and anti-Governmental activity." Few politically significant prisoners have been willing to sign, regarding it as dishonorable.

Interior Minister Patakos complained to me: "Some of them are getting more hardened instead of reforming. They have organized by tents; a leader for each tent, and a group leader for each 8 or 10 tents. They have a president for each of the camps, and a general commander for the whole island. They have collected 250,000 drachmas [a little more than \$8,000] among themselves, for what purpose I do not know, but I am sure it is not a good one."

As one of the "Communist" leaders of the hardened prisoners, Patakos mentioned Dimitrios Stratis. When I remarked that the 78-year-old Stratis, a veteran trade-union leader and leftwing parliamentary deputy whom I know well, was not a Communist, Patakos replied: "He calls himself a Socialist, but he is a Communist. In Greece, we have right people and wrong people. All those who are against the country are Communists. Stratis is a Communist in his heart and his works. They are all liars."

Fiaros and the courts-martial which hand out sentences of five years for writing slogans on walls and eight years for *lese-majeste* are not the Government's only instruments of intimidation. Some Greeks beyond the borders have had their citizenship revoked—most notably, the actress Melina Mercouri, who seems to have come out ahead on the exchange.

Many persons regarded as potential troublemakers have been taken to police stations and badly beaten, as a warning, without being formally arrested; this treatment has been most often used on students and other young people. The security police have visited private employers with lists of "unreliable" individuals who are to be discharged. Many people have had their telephones removed because of their political views; all have been discouraged from talking politics on the phone or writing about it to friends by the knowledge that phones are likely to be tapped and letters opened.

But the junta has not relied on terror alone to consolidate its position. Rather, it has systematically endeavored to entrench itself in every aspect of Greek life. On the national level, despite the existence of a nominally civilian Government, an army officer plays a key role in every ministry—in some cases as minister, in others as secretary general, in still others as a political commissar without official title.

The tenure of civil servants has been abolished; many have been removed for their ideas, and all have been ordered to pledge their loyalty to the regime on pain of dismissal. The purge has not been confined to such politically sensitive departments as the police, where 118 high-ranking officials and police doctors were dismissed in mid-August. (Others had been ousted previously, individually or in smaller batches.) It has even affected the director of the Byzantine Museum, an internationally known scholar.

Locally, the regime has destroyed the system of nonpolitical nomarchs or district administrators, whose establishment American advisers once regarded as one of their major achievements. More than half the nomarchs have been removed; most of their replacements are army officers. While asserting its belief in the decentralization of authority, the Government has removed large numbers of elected mayors and local councils and replaced them with appointees chosen in Athens.

Nor has it confined itself to the governmental sphere. It has seized control of the Orthodox Church. It has dissolved hundreds of private organizations and removed the officers of numerous others, including bar as-

sociations, agricultural cooperatives and the Jewish community.

The United States Embassy in Athens clearly does not like the regime, though most Greeks regard it as responsible for the coup—an opinion the junta assiduously encourages. (A skeptical friend remarked to me, after seeing one of the coup leaders in action, "Now I believe what you say about the Americans not being behind the coup; they'd never have chosen these people!") But the Embassy also regards the present Government as a lesser evil than a revolt against it, and has therefore placed its hope in persuading the junta to practice self-denial and restore democracy voluntarily. Its influence is limited, since the junta now feels certain that the United States will continue military aid whatever happens. (Some weeks after the coup, the U.S. did cut off certain items, estimated by the Defense Department at 10 percent of the total.)

Nevertheless, the Embassy and State Department see great cause for optimism in the appointment of a committee of jurists to draw up a revised Constitution by the end of the year for submission to a plebiscite. This is supposed to lead to a speedy and orderly restoration of constitutional government.

This assessment appears to contain a large measure of wishful thinking. The group named to draw up the new Constitution included a few persons of some distinction, several conservative nonentities and a few with rather unpleasant reputations. But the members were not consulted before their appointments were announced, and some of the best-known have refused to serve.

The Government's influence on the deliberations of the committee is not likely to be cast on the side of democratic institutions. While Premier Constantine V. Kollis has said the new Constitution will be only slightly changed from the present one, journalists close to the junta have called for much more drastic alterations. Among the suggestions offered are a ban on political activity by anyone who has ever cooperated with the extreme left, a requirement that all candidates have loyalty certificates from the security police, and the exclusion from office of anyone who has ever held foreign citizenship.

The first of these provisions would not only bar all those in the United Democratic Left (EDA), a party which contains some hard-core Communists but also a wide range of non-Communists. It would also ban most members of Papandreou's Center Union and a number of people now on the right—including some ex-Communists who hold office under the junta or are among its advisers. (For example, Theophylaktos Papaconstantinou, whom the Government has placed in charge of the press, is a former Communist theoretician. So is the editor of *Eleftheros Kosmos*, the newspaper widely regarded as closest to the junta.)

The significance of the second is shown by a story told by a friend who had served as an officer attached to the general staff. One of his duties was to investigate the qualifications of officer candidates. In the dossier of one he found a report from the Security Police: "A is a dangerous subversive, being closely associated with the politician Constantine Rendis." At the time of the report, Rendis, who belonged to the right-center, was Minister of Public Order and the superior of the police official who wrote it.

The third proposal is aimed primarily at Andreas Papandreou, a former American citizen and the man on whom millions of Greeks rest their hopes for their country's future.

When I asked Patakos what constitutional changes the Government would propose to the committee, he mentioned none of these specific points, although he referred in a general way to changes in the qualifications of deputies. In response to a question, he

added that the Premier named by the King would still have to receive the support of a majority in Parliament. He added that these ideas were merely being considered very tentatively; the one point on which the Government was determined was that the new Constitution must cure all the faults of the existing system. Apprised of this statement, one diplomat remarked: "That's easy; all he has to do is change eight million Greeks."

Whatever kind of Constitution may emerge from the committee, the problem of implementation will still remain. The embassy appears to rely on the King and Patakos—the member of the junta who is regarded as most susceptible to the influence of the palace—to promote the restoration of a constitutional regime. Patakos, however, does not seem to have any such intention. He told me: "We are not interested in elections; if we were, we wouldn't have made a revolution. This system we have now is the best system, because what we have now we have achieved with the people's support, so there is no need for elections. We have more serious problems than elections. What we have done we did in order to achieve certain aims, and when we have achieved these aims, then we will have time for elections. . . . We are frank people. We are not liars and we do not want to make false elections, the way they do in Russia with 98 per cent; therefore there will be no elections."

But even if Patakos could be induced to support a prompt return to constitutionality, it is unlikely that he could accomplish it. Unlike Colonel Papadopoulos, who organized the coup, Patakos appears to have little talent for conspiracy or political infighting. He seems a basically decent if insensitive man, whose political naivete is almost incredible. (He is responsible for most of the pronouncements which have brought ridicule on the junta—the bans on miniskirts, beards, long hair, etc.) A soldier of peasant origin (a brother is said to be still working on the roads in Crete), he rose slowly through the ranks for 37 years, becoming a brigadier general and commander of the tank school three months before the coup. Only then does he seem to have been brought into the conspiracy—because the tanks he controlled were necessary to its success. One suspects that he joined partly because of resentment at the establishment—civil and military—on which he blamed his slow promotion (he talks with obvious bitterness of the 10 years he lingered as a lieutenant colonel), and partly because he really believes the moralistic slogans to which others in the Government pay lip service.

In any showdown between Patakos and Papadopoulos, the latter seems far more likely to be the victor. Indeed, the other members of the junta may in any case drop Patakos when they feel strong enough to do so. He might even end up on Yiaros. If he should, I would not expect him to sign a declaration in order to obtain his release.

But if the junta does not seem likely to give up power voluntarily, there are factors which may eventually lead to its downfall. One is the difficulty of getting competent personnel to work for it. The population of Greece is about the same as that of New York City, and the proportion of trained personnel is much lower. If one eliminates a majority of the population—and a much larger majority of the well educated—on political grounds, it becomes difficult to find competent people for important positions. Moreover, many whom the junta might be willing to appoint do not want to serve under present conditions; in one instance, it has had to draft a retired official into the army in order to make him assume a top post in a ministry.

This difficulty may explain some of the peculiar appointments the Government has made. One, particularly strange for a regime which talks in terms of moral regeneration, is that of Constantine Tifanos as Secretary

General of the Ministry of Coordination and Alternate Governor of the World Bank, two of the most important economic posts it had to fill. Mr. Thanos was, a few years back, rejected for a teaching post at the University of Athens because it was discovered that the thesis he submitted in support of his application was a verbatim plagiarism from a memorandum by Prof. Benjamin Beckhart of Columbia. The incident is not the only one of its type in Mr. Thanos's career.

But the Government may well feel that it cannot look too closely into the moral credentials of anyone who can help it solve its economic problems, for these are very great, and almost certain to increase. At the beginning of June, Greece had short-term debts of about \$20-million more than its official gold and foreign-exchange reserves. (Some \$100-million in gold sovereigns, the purchase and sale of which were used to stabilize the currency internally, did not appear in the official reserves. The exact amount in this fund was secret.) And Greece's three principal sources of foreign exchange—emigrant remittances (about one Greek worker in five is employed abroad), tourism and shipping—all seem likely to drop sharply this year, as does foreign investment.

In addition, it is almost certain that a loan of about \$100-million which had been promised by the European Economic Community will now be postponed, if not canceled. Nor have the financial prospects been improved by the resignation of the internationally known economists Xenophon Zolotas and Michael Psemazoglou as Governor and First Deputy Governor of the Bank of Greece.

No wonder that a former minister says of Col. Nicholas Makarezos, who as Minister of Coordination is in charge of economic policy: "He's the only one of them who thinks seriously about problems; that's why he always looks worried." The colonel's worries seem likely to come to a head within the next six months. By that time, the Government is widely expected to run out of cash. (It is already asking for U.S. economic aid.) It may be able to renew credits as they come due, simply because creditors will prefer to keep their loans on the books instead of pushing them into default. But without new credits, which seem unlikely, there will have to be drastic import restrictions and currency controls; there may be a devaluation of the drachma and a sharp reduction in the standard of living.

The political repercussions of such a development are unpredictable. It may be that the opposition will still be too disorganized to take advantage of the situation, and that the Government will be able to ride out the crisis. But it is also possible that students—who are difficult to control because their leadership is always being renewed—and workers returning from northern Europe, where many of them have already organized against the junta, will by then form the basis of an effective resistance movement. And if the regime is not able to keep up the standard of living of the armed forces—particularly the officer corps—trouble could come from that quarter.

Such a situation could conceivably result in a counter coup. Or the junta might turn to a foreign adventure, particularly in Cyprus. This past summer, there were sounds from Athens of a new drive for *enosis*, the union of Cyprus with Greece. (They produced no sympathetic echoes among Greek Cypriotes.)

Or the regime might seek to rally popular support by swinging in a Peronist or National Bolshevik direction. There are already some signs that it is considering this option. One is a decree prohibiting any Greek, including employees of foreign companies and international organizations in Greece, from getting more in salaries, allowance and pensions than the Premier receives—about \$18,-

000 a year. (The junta issued a decree raising the salaries of Cabinet ministers substantially, but forbade the press to mention it. Some days later another decree was issued reducing the salaries—but to a point well above their previous levels. The reduction was then publicized, without mentioning the previous raise.) It has also raised pensions for peasants by about two-thirds. And Agriculture Minister Alexander Matthaïou's first radio address was not only filled with leftist phrases, but was couched in a form of the *Demotiki* (the popular language, traditionally championed by the left as against the *Katharevousa* or "pure" language backed by the right) so extreme that it is regarded as the trademark of the Communist party and shunned by everybody else. A move in this direction might also take on an anti-monarchical aspect; not all the members of the junta regard the King as indispensable.

It might seem strange for a rightist government to move in this direction. But the junta does not represent the traditional Greek right, rooted largely in property and birth. Its leaders are men of lower and middle-class background. They may hate the left, but they have no love for the conservative establishment.

INSURANCE COMPANIES PLAN SLUM INVESTMENT THROUGH RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM

(Mr. FRASER (at the request of Mr. WALDIE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's efforts to develop creative cooperation between private industry and Government is bearing fruit. A major breakthrough in this effort is the recent announcement by the chairman of the board of Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. that the life insurance companies of the country have pledged a special effort to work toward alleviation of the problems of the central cities. Their pledge takes the form of a \$1 billion investment in improving housing conditions largely through the Rent Supplement program which the President is urging Congress to extend.

The Minneapolis Tribune of September 17 commented favorably on the insurance companies' commitment to the improvement of life in the Nation's cities, and with permission granted I include the Tribune editorial in the RECORD:

A ONE-BILLION-DOLLAR COMMITMENT TO BETTER CITIES

"There is a great feeling that the attempts to do something about the urban problem have been mainly speeches, programs and committees," said John S. Pillsbury Jr., president of Northwestern National Life Insurance Co. "The people who are suffering say, 'Let's see some action.'"

The life insurance industry announced last week a \$1-billion commitment to action. The money will be invested in housing and job-producing industries in the poverty areas of the cities. Twin Cities-based Northwestern National Life and Minnesota Mutual Life Insurance Co. each has agreed to invest up to \$5 million in this way. Other companies that do business in Minnesota probably will add to the slum-investment cash.

The industry action is an example of the enlightened self-interest we have been urging to help solve the problems of our urban society. In the short run, in this period of tight money and high interest rates, the in-

surance industry could find more lucrative investment opportunities. In the long run, however, that industry and the economy will benefit from the uplift of the poor.

The action also is an example of how the government can encourage private business to become involved in such problems. In this case, the federal government can take some of the risk out of the investments through rent supplements, mortgage guarantees and other measures. We hope Congress comes through with rent supplement appropriations.

For Minneapolis, the additional money should provide more financing to buy or rehabilitate inner-city homes. It might furnish capital for landlords to fix up their property to lease to the city for scattered-site public housing under a rent subsidy program. It could speed up development of new housing in the Grant renewal area on the North Side.

We applaud the insurance industry and look for more examples of such major involvement in the great urban crisis of our times.

(Mr. FRASER (at the request of Mr. WALDIE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. FRASER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

COMPULSORY LOAN PROPOSAL

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. WALDIE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, on September 20, I addressed this body on the desirability of an involuntary loan from each taxpayer of 10 percent of his tax liability instead of the proposed 10 percent surtax. I said that the surcharge idea was advanced by Economist Harold M. Somers, of the University of California at Los Angeles.

I was pleased to note in today's letters to the editor section of the Washington Post that Professor Melville J. Ulmer, of the University of Maryland, has also endorsed the surcharge as an effective way to halt inflation.

Professor Ulmer points to the dangers of the present stalemate on anti-inflation legislation, and to the inherent flexibility of the surcharge as a tool to combat both upturns and downturns in the economy.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to include Professor Ulmer's letter at this point, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

COMPULSORY LOAN PROPOSAL

Recent price increases could be only a modest beginning to a sharp inflation in the year ahead, if the official forecast of the Council of Economic Advisers is correct. Yet, despite abundant debate, decisive action of some kind to counter the upward trend of prices does not seem imminent. In fact for a year and a half, while the consumers' price index climbed by fully five per cent, the Nation's economic policy has called to mind nothing so much as a mesmerized bird, frozen in the glare of an onrushing snake.

Underlying the recent indecision, however, are three formidable obstacles that are not easily surmounted. First, only the blissfully innocent place unqualified faith in economic forecasts, official or otherwise. There are

H 12986

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

October 4, 1967

crosscurrents on the horizon and six months from now, by the time a promptly enacted tax increase could take effect, economic activity could be moving downward. The tax change, in that event, would just deepen the recession.

Secondly, the heavily taxed American public has been less than enthusiastic about the Administration's proposal for a 10 per cent increase in the levy on incomes—a fact not lost on members of Congress. Thirdly, those who eye with proper skepticism the space program, the huge public investment in supersonic aircraft, the superfluous troops maintained in Europe, and some similar items in the Federal budget, wonder why public expenditures cannot be reduced so that a tax increase would be unnecessary.

But meanwhile, *nothing* is done. And the probability that the official forecast is right cannot be discounted, and ought not to be ignored.

To break the stalemate, the present writer wishes to offer a proposal that would block inflation promptly, if it develops, and yet meet the objections of those who oppose the administration's tax increase. The proposal is that each taxpayer be required to lend the government an amount equal to 10 per cent of his tax liability, the sum to be repaid with five per cent cumulative interest at the end of three years. The loan would appear, initially, as a surcharge on tax liability, and would have much the same deflationary impact on the Nation's spending as an outright increase in taxes. As a loan with interest, however, it would be less punishing to the taxpayer. It should also, therefore, be more palatable to Congress.

The use of this compulsory loan technique has one other highly important advantage. It must be acknowledged that the forecast for further inflation could be wrong, and the present proposal can easily allow for this possibility. Although the taxpayer's loan is nominally for three years, the President should be empowered to repay the loan in full at any earlier date, if desirable. Hence, if business activity turned down, the loan would be promptly refunded with all the effects of an expansionary tax cut—but without the interminable debates and delays that ordinarily attend changes in tax rates.

The plan proposed here is based on the "forced savings" theory of John Maynard Keynes, offered as a means for financing World War II, and a similar scheme suggested by Harold M. Somers of the University of California at Los Angeles. The plan is not meant as a substitute for cutting low priority items from the Nation's budget. These should be reduced or eliminated regardless of what is done to taxes. The plan is not designed as a substitute for ending oil depletion allowances or for closing other tax loopholes. Nevertheless, we may be waiting for some time for such commendable achievements. Meanwhile, the present economic situation requires prompt and forthright action. Adoption of the compulsory loan plan would enable us to take it.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON AND PROGRESS

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. WALDIE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment to congratulate the President of the United States, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Commerce, and others who have come up with what I regard as a most imaginative program in our constant struggle in the war against poverty.

What I refer to, of course, is the announced plan to mobilize the vast resources of private industry so that it might work, along with our Federal Government, to assist in finding jobs and to provide the proper training for the many thousands of what we call our hard-core unemployed.

As Secretary of Labor Wirtz said the other day, "jobs are the live ammunition in the war on poverty, and the right kind of jobs are jobs in private employment." He made a distinction between on-the-job training as compared with institutional training, pointing out that on-the-job training is the best kind of training for the hard-core unemployed. And of course this on-the-job training can only come through the cooperation and participation of private enterprise.

The Federal Government will increase its assistance to the private sector of our economy in order to generate a large-scale response from this sector in creating new job opportunities either in existing plants already located near the central cities, or in plants to be built with some form of Government assistance. In other words, the Government will help relieve the private enterprise firm of the extra expenses it will incur in the process of training and placement of the hard-core unemployed.

I will not attempt to go into all the technicalities of the new plan but I would like to make two points:

First, I don't think this is a radical departure from the Government's pattern of efforts to help solve the hard-core unemployment problems. Rather it is a natural extension of the overall concentrated employment programs of the major cities which has been so successful in enlisting the cooperation of private employers.

Second, I am fully confident that American private enterprise can lick just about any problem and in partnership with the Federal Government under such an imaginative program, I am confident that this pressing problem of the hard-core unemployed will at last be solved.

I am proud to note that San Antonio is one of the cities selected for this pilot program.

I look forward to seeing this program implemented and I hope that our private sector will rally to the call and give it all it has got.

SAN ANTONIO YOUTH FAIR

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. WALDIE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, on September 19 and 20, a distinguished group of San Antonio citizens once again staged a tremendous Youth Opportunities Fair in the historic Villita Assembly Hall.

It was our community's way of helping its young to find their way, to discover their "niche" in life, if possible.

I would like to share with you and my colleagues the report of Mr. Roy A. Broussard, the fair's manager.

I want to salute Mr. Broussard and members of the advisory council which planned the fair for the wonderful work and dedication which they gave to this

unique and outstanding event. They are: Ben Singleton, A. V. Malabuso, Neil Ohrt, Eugene Salmon, Gilbert de la Cruz, George Purvis, Ismael Landez, Francis B. Roser, Alvino Perez, Ann Van Griner, Augusto Vidales, Jack P. Mulrell, Al Abrego, Harry Eurns, S. L. Deckard, Rudy Guerrero, Manuel Ruiz Ibanez, Rev. A. C. Sutton, Arin Whitehead, Joe V. Alvarado, Guacalupe Gibson, William Bently, Mitchel L. Armons, Clarkson Gross, Bill Henderson, Louis Alvarez, Bill Bailey, Dudley McEvoy, Dr. William Elizondo, S. A. Robinson, Rev. Henry Casso, Judge James A. McKay, Jr., James Martin, Jr., Clean LeBaron, Johnnie Johnson, D. R. Bolton, Joseph A. Freire, Jr., W. L. Flatt, Dallas Clark, B. J. Nichol, Dolores Bradley, Jake Roariguez, Clyde Smith, and Charles Cueller.

Mr. Broussard's report is as follows:

YOUTH OPPORTUNITY FAIR BRINGING CAREERS WITHIN REACH

At 2:30 on the afternoon of September 19, 1967, Mayor Walter W. McAllister opened the Second Annual Youth Opportunity Fair in San Antonio, Texas. At the opening ceremony were a number of local and state dignitaries, approximately 400 young people, and the majority of school superintendents representing San Antonio's fourteen (14) independent school districts.

It was a typical, warm and sunny day as the mayor "busted" the ceremonial ribbon made of newspaper want ads on job opportunities. Little did the audience realize that hurricane Buelat was to play a major role during this second annual career information program.

In spite of the rain, wind, and general turmoil instigated by this fierce old gal, the second annual Youth Opportunity Fair was, nonetheless, tremendously successful.

In spite of the constant rainfall and severe weather news bulletins, some fifty-five organizations had exhibits assembled in the Villita Assembly Hall—an excellent indication of the committed concern of the community of Bexar County for its population of young people.

To not list each of these exhibitors in this report would certainly be an injustice; to list every single exhibitor is definitely justifiable, as well as a number indication of the gratitude felt by the Advisory Council of the Youth Opportunity Fair, Inc.

Hence, the council salutes and commends each of the following exhibitors who played a magnificent role in bringing careers within reach.

EXHIBITORS 1967 YOUTH OPPORTUNITY FAIR BUSINESS

IBM Corporation.
Braniff International.
Southwestern Bell Telephone Company.
Friedrich Refrigerators, Inc.
Precision Manufacturing Company.
Sears, Roebuck and Company.
Joske's of Texas.
Coca-Cola Bottling Company.
Travelers Insurance Company.
United Services Automobile Association.
Frost National Bank.
National Bank of Commerce.
Handy-Andy, Inc.
Texas Insurance Field Men's Association.
San Antonio Hotel and Motel Association.

MEDICAL

Baptist Memorial Hospital.
Robert B. Green Hospital.
Santa Rosa Medical Center.
Southwest Texas Methodist Hospital.
San Antonio District Dental Hygienist Society.

GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

City of San Antonio.
City Public Service Board.

October 4, 1967

Approved For Release 2001/11/01 : CIA-RDP69B00369R000200290056-2

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S14175

cide treaty, for example, specifies that persons convicted of genocide be sentenced to death or life imprisonment. This interferes with normal court discretion.

But consider this in connection with all the treaties. The only nations that have not approved one or more are these: Bolivia, the Maldives, Paraguay, Spain, Togo, the Union of South Africa, Uruguay, Yemen—and the United States of America. Fine company we keep!

THE BADLY TARNISHED IMAGE OF KING HUSSEIN OF JORDAN

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, events in the Middle East since May have seriously tarnished the image which King Hussein had sought to build in the eyes of the people of the United States.

The image which his imagemakers had sought to convey was that of a moderate ruler seeking to stave off attempts by his fanatical Arab neighbors to pull him off his throne while the King, in turn, sought only to make economically viable a desolately, backward country.

The truth is that King Hussein has through the years been propped up on his throne by U.S. dollars—over \$436 million through fiscal year 1966 to be exact. Without that economic and military aid there would have been no King Hussein sitting on his throne in Amman. Neither would the artificially created nation of Jordan, have continued to exist.

The reason advanced by the State Department for all this aid to Jordan was that King Hussein was a leavening influence in the Middle East—that without King Hussein's moderating efforts in that area of the world the often expressed hostility of the other Arab nations would erupt into a military attempt to carry out their threats to drive Israel into the sea.

That fanciful image was destroyed by King Hussein's actions during the 6-day war in the Middle East.

It can be said, in the light of the events which took place at that time, that whatever grief lies ahead for King Hussein and the people of Jordan was brought about by their own willful actions.

On May 31, 1967, King Hussein went to Cairo to sign a so-called defense pact with Egypt which provided that—

In case of the commencement of military operations, the Chief of Staff of the United Arab Republic Armed Forces will assume the direction of operations in both countries.

In an interview on June 2, 1967, King Hussein, belying the image of moderation which he had sought to project, stated:

Our increased cooperation with Egypt and other Arab States both in the East and in the West will enable us to march along the right road which will lead us to the erasure of the shame and the liberation of Palestine. This is a cornerstone of our policy.

On June 5, 1967, Israel offered King Hussein an honorable way of staying out of the impending military conflagration. The Prime Minister of Israel sent a message to King Hussein through the United Nations representative in the area, General Odd Bull, in which King Hussein was told:

We shall not initiate any action whatsoever against Jordan. However, should Jordan

open hostilities, we shall react with all our might and he will have to bear the full responsibility for all the consequences.

Jordan's reply to Israel's conciliatory offer blared forth from Radio Amman on the morning of June 5.

At 9:15 a.m. on June 5, 1967, Radio Amman carried the following call to arms to the people of Jordan:

Free citizens, heroic sons of Jordan. The hoped-for moment has arrived. The hour which you longed for is here. Forward to arms, to battle, to new pages of glory. To regain our rights, to smash the aggressor, to revenge!

At 9:58 that same morning Radio Amman exhorted:

O Arabs, wherever you are! Hit everywhere and hit till the end. The end of Israel is in your hands. Forward, soldiers, to victory. Cooperate wherever you are. Fly, o eagles, o heroic pilots.

Less than an hour later, at 10:45 a.m., King Hussein went on Radio Amman to tell his people:

O brethren, wherever you are stationed along the lengthy front! Be certain that our forces and the whole Arab nation will meet the test and reach the target. The decisive battle has started and I hope it will soon end in the victory which we all pray for.

These are not the words of moderation and peace which the image built for King Hussein in the United States would have led us to expect.

These are the words of an aggressor—of the leader of a nation who had never laid aside his intense determination to destroy the neighboring nation of Israel, the only oasis of freedom and democracy in the desert of Arab backwardness in the Middle East.

Moreover, secret orders to the Jordanian commanders captured by the Israelis called for the extermination of every man, woman, and child in Israel.

And yet this same King Hussein, who spurned the olive branch of peace when it was offered by Israel and chose instead the ways of ruthless war, is seen today fluttering from Moscow to Washington, hat in hand, seeking more weapons to support his continued aggressive intentions against Israel.

The time has come for the United States to view King Hussein realistically and not through illusory, rose-colored glasses. Further economic and military assistance to Jordan should be stopped at once and should not be resumed until Jordan has agreed to sit down at the peace table with Israel. If King Hussein chooses to squander his country's meager economic resources on armed aggression rather than on its economic development, he should not be supported in these rash endeavors by U.S. economic and military assistance.

But above all, the people of the United States should appraise King Hussein for what he really is: a backward Arab monarch more interested in military aggrandizement than in peace and who has forfeited all claims for further support from the taxpayers of the United States.

RIOTS, SLUMS, AND BANKING

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, a highly significant speech was delivered last week to the American Bankers Association

convention by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], who serves as the ranking Republican on the Committee on Banking and Currency. His speech is justly receiving wide national attention.

The distinguished Senator struck a vital note in calling upon America's bankers "to assume major, new leadership roles in helping to bring the needy, downtrodden slumdweller back into the mainstream of American economic life." He rightly pointed out that solutions to the problems of poverty cannot be worked out on a mass basis. Poverty is personal, and the solution must be found one person at a time, one job at a time, one step at a time.

Senator BENNETT—who speaks authoritatively through many years of close association with the banking world—expressed his deep concern that two ways of life have existed side by side in this country for 30 years: the way of free enterprise, and the way of welfare. He said:

We will never solve the problems of the poor of 1967 until we can move them out of the half-world of government support and make them part of the real economic world we call the private enterprise system.

To help to achieve the urgent goal of breaking down the attitudes which separate the poor from the rest of American society, Senator BENNETT asked for new public relations programs to acquaint the Nation's poor with the proper uses of banks as savings and credit institutions, and to encourage Negro college students in particular to enter the banking field.

I feel that Senator BENNETT's speech, entitled "Riots, Slums, and Banking," should receive the wide circulation of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, together with a complementary article entitled "U.S. Job Training Plan Heartening," written by David Lawrence, and published in yesterday's Washington Evening Star.

There being no objection, the speech and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIOTS, SLUMS, AND BANKING

(Speech by Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, to the American Bankers Association Convention, September 25, 1967)

Charles Dickens, in the opening paragraph of his classic novel, *A Tale of Two Cities*, gave us with uncanny accuracy an excellent description of America's present domestic dilemma:

"It was the best of times, it was the worst of times," he wrote. "It was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness. It was the epoch of belief, it was the epoch of incredulity. It was the season of light, it was the season of darkness. It was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair."

If you are in the mainstream of our American economic system based on private property, which rewards individual enterprise with the increasing comforts of a growing production of an explosively expanding economy, it is the best of times. But if you consider those who are outside this system's mainstream and the number who are on government welfare, it is the worst of times.

This government-centered program for the care of the needy has been with us for a third of a century, and to its authors and advocates, this promised to be, in Dickens' words, the age of wisdom. Now even some of its friends are admitting its failures, thus branding it as the "age of foolishness."

Approved For Release 2001/11/01 : CIA-RDP69B00369R000200290056-2

October 4, 1967

Thirty years ago, all America was groping in a season of darkness. So far as the value of our private enterprise system was concerned, it was an epoch of incredulity, a winter of despair. This was not our first depression, but in the earlier ones Americans came through on their own courage and resources, and with the help of their families, neighbors and friends plus unorganized county help. Even when the going was rough, they never became separated from the system. But this time, taking advantage of the fact that the faith of many faltered, astute politicians stepped in and offered an attractive alternative—government welfare. Since then the two ways of life have existed side by side, and both have grown.

Our economic indicators record that the benefits of our free enterprise system are at an all-time high, to be shared by those who participate and contribute.

In the second quarter of this year, our gross national product exceeded an annual rate of \$775 billion, and disposable personal income reached an all-time high of \$540 billion. Distributed equally over our population, this amounted to \$2,716 annually for each man, woman, and child in this country. Corporate profits both before and after taxes reached new levels. Non-military employment surpassed any previous mark, as 76 million of our citizens were gainfully employed. Unemployment, according to the latest figures, is at a satisfactory rate of 3.9 per cent on a seasonally adjusted basis. We have more money, more purchasing power, more education, more of the things that make life pleasant, and more savings than ever before in history. Commercial banking has participated in and contributed to this growth and now has a total of \$334 billion in loans and investments. Truly, in many respects, this is the best of times.

In the face of this evidence, one might conclude that related problems of social and economic weakness would be at an all-time low. Unfortunately this is not true. The basic problems of the depressed 30's have survived and even flourished in the shadow-world of government welfare.

Although the number of individuals and families with incomes below the poverty level has dropped steadily as prosperity has increased throughout the last three decades, the number of public relief welfare rolls has continued to increase at what is to many an alarming rate. Three decades ago, there were just over 3 million persons receiving government welfare payments. Today, that number has increased to over 12 million. The dollar outlay for welfare payments has increased over eight-fold during the period until today it is over \$5 billion annually. What is startling is that some individuals have never known any other way of life. Their parents and grandparents lived on public welfare, and they have been brought up in this same environment, depending on these payments for their livelihood. True, there are among those dependent on welfare many who would prefer gainful employment, but they have been squeezed out of the labor market because their skills and education do not qualify them to earn today's minimum wage requirements.

Along with this increase in the number of welfare recipients, we have seen a tragic increase in crime, divorce, bankruptcy, illegitimacy, slum housing, alcoholism, and drug usage. It is surprising to know that there are six serious crimes committed each minute in this country. Crime has skyrocketed 62 per cent in the last six years alone, while the population has risen by only nine per cent. There is more than a murder every hour, a burglary every 23 seconds, and an auto theft every 57 seconds. Personal bankruptcies in fiscal 1967 were 191,729, compared with about 40,000 per year during the depressed thirties. Illegitimate births were at a rate of 7 per thousand unmarried women in the child bearing years of 15 to 44 years of age, three

decades ago. Today, the rate is more than triple at 25 per 1,000 unmarried women in that age range. Alcoholism is increasing annually and drug usage is becoming almost commonplace.

While these earmarks of a corrupt society are not limited to those who are outside of the mainstream of American affluent life, they are more prominent among those groups.

We are beginning to accept the fact that there is a definite correlation between unemployment, lack of education, slum housing, and crime. Latest unemployment statistics indicate that the unemployment rate among non-whites is twice what it is among the white work force. In 1960, 46 per cent of the non-white urban population lives in unsound housing compared with 14 per cent of the white urban population. Crime by non-whites is at a significantly higher rate. On a per population basis, the incidence of murder is 5 times as great among non-whites. Forcible rape occurs 4 times as often; robbery incidence is 5 times as great; prostitution occurs at a five to one ratio and narcotics violations at a three to one ratio. All these sad statistics strengthen the evidence that the recent rioting has been largely by those who are not participating in production and ownership in our system.

In a way, then, we've seen the concept of Federal paternalism come full circle and grow in the process. It has preserved the economic misery of the 30's and added to it the deeper suffering of older and more overcrowded slums, and the breakdown of the family, the current expression of which is hatred, crime, rioting. Even the system's friends are beginning to realize that it has failed, as revealed by these very recent statements made in the Senate and on the record. Let me quote just a few statements from some of the Senate's most liberal members and from one of the most vocal of civil rights spokesmen. Here's one statement by a recently elected liberal Democrat:

"In the midst of these riots, and all this difficulty, one of the problems is obvious, that our promise and our claimed achievements did not match the substance of what we did."

Here are five others, by other liberals:

1. "Thirty years ago, it was the private system, the private sector of the economy, which had failed. But now, after 30 years, it is the government welfare system which has broken down."

2. "For these same 30 years, we have had categorical welfare programs—yet every year we seem less able to help people off the welfare rolls into positions of dignity and independence."

3. "The antipoverty efforts . . . have proven to be an effective curse. I see these paternalists coming into our cities under the guise of community developers, and they are an effective menace."

4. "We have had misplaced good will, misplaced kindness, and programs which bring relief rather than bring rehabilitation, and recreation in human terms. They are not answers to our urgent plight today."

5. "I would underscore the fact that massive doses of the same old things will only lead us more aggressively to national self-destruction."

It is hopeful that many in Congress have finally come to realize what has always been obvious to some, that government paternalistic control and handouts, instead of encouraging people to get off relief, actually tend to attract more to welfare as a way of life, and once in this pattern to cling to it. This is particularly true for the program for aid to dependent children, which, for as long as three generations in some families, has made the rearing of illegitimate children a source of income.

With this realization has come a challenge to try to break this vicious circle, and new programs are being suggested for the transitional period. One common concept is to add

some form of training to many existing programs, including this same program for aid to families with dependent children. In addition to such other expensive War on Poverty programs as the Job Corps and the Community Action set-up, these mothers are going to be pressured into some sort of training. This idea will require still another government program for the day-care of children whose mothers are being trained.

In theory and in spirit, this training-by-government approach is commendable, but if past experience is any guide, the training will take place in a vacuum, unrelated to a specific job, unless such a job is, in turn, supplied by government.

What I have said about jobs is also true for government solution to the problem of housing. We have had low-income housing programs for three decades and yet over 40 per cent of housing in many sections of our cities is being categorized as substandard, dilapidated, and unhealthy. Federally-provided public housing was a natural partner of Federally-financed welfare cash income. But neither has met the essential spiritual need a person has to manage his own affairs. This can only be satisfied when those slum dwellers who wish to do so can have a chance to have an equity in their own homes.

At best, all programs initiated by government include some significant degree of continuing Federal control or supervision of the persons needing help, which means that after all we are still only making different patterns in the same old circle. Referring again to my point that we have in the United States two separate economic systems spiraling together, with a minimum of overlapping, it is clear to me that we will never solve the problem of the poor of 1967 until we can move them out of the half-world of government support, and make them a part of the real economic world we call the private enterprise system. That this can be done is demonstrated by the fact that many trapped in the 30's fought their own way back and have shared in the free economy's rewards.

While it is easy to agree that this is desirable, it should also be clear that government can never provide the leadership needed to bring it about. In the first place, many men in government have themselves never been a part of the productive side of our free system, and therefore do not understand or trust it. This is evident from the criticism which has been leveled against the student loan program that banks have tried so hard to make successful even at some cost in profit. Yet it is being assailed as a bonus to bankers and it is suggested that direct government loans should replace the guarantee program. Another example of this mistrust is a flood insurance program which has been approved by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. The program is set up to use private industry to the maximum extent with Federal Government reinsurance for catastrophic losses. There were accusations that the program represented a guaranteed profit to industry with government taking all of the risk and that the program should be replaced with an all government program. Moreover, there are also men whose political careers have been built on the concept that the votes of people who are dependent on government can be mostly easily controlled.

So the responsibility falls upon the men whose faith in our free system, and understanding of its processes, have made them leaders in it. Only these men can actually develop programs which will bring the outcasts in—provide the jobs, the specific training, and the proof that the free system can provide greater incentive, security, and satisfaction than the government sheltered one.

It is a sad commentary that life in the government welfare compound has produced one or more generations of economic illiterates, economic cripples, and economic agnostics. The so-called self-appointed authorities on consumerism, including many in govern-

difficult. In spite of the handicap of a paucity of information, enforcement officials still do a remarkable job of tracing those committing bank crimes—but the persistent penalty of poor information compounds the important task of conviction. Lack of fingerprints, positive identification or possession of known identifiable stolen currency results in acquittals.

Tougher rules of evidence in today's courts, coupled with conflicting or insufficient identification, must certainly turn loose hardened and experienced criminals who very probably will try their luck again.

Is bank crime the other banker's problem, or is it truly one that should concern you and me? I believe that we ought to share a fraternal belief that a crime against any bank is a crime against all banks. Certainly the premiums of our blank-t bonds represent a composite assessment of the cost of these crimes.

As individuals and as institutions, we share the increased burden of law-enforcement in our present society. Every one of us must shudder and decry the shame of ruthless criminal activity which results in death to bank officers, employees, and customers.

Are we doing enough to make a real contribution toward prevention; apprehension; conviction of people who prey on our banks? A considered judgment would indicate we are not.

We are notably deficient in the installation of complete protective devices and alarm equipment. We do not avail ourselves of booklets and films for employee information and training, which are available from law agencies and insurance companies. The advisory help from the FBI and other agencies is not drawn upon by individual banks or groups of bankers for instructional and informational purposes.

Even when an education and hold-up drill program has been instituted in our banks, personnel "refreshers" are not frequent enough to keep pace with employee turnover.

Comparative statistics prove that, where an aggressive crime prevention program has been introduced in a given area, the incidence of bank crime—particularly hold-ups—diminishes dramatically. The individual bank and the banking system are direct beneficiaries whenever your bank and mine intelligently use known preventive measures and protective devices against the crook who wants to "do business" with our banks.

MIDDLE EAST REFUGEES

(Mr. FASCELL (at the request of Mr. PRYOR) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most tragic consequences of the brief but bloody war in the Middle East has been the desperate plight of the hundreds of thousands of refugees made homeless by the fighting.

Those displaced by the recent war are adding yet another dismal chapter to the tragedy of over 1 million people who now live in the Middle East without permanent shelter, any sources of livelihood or any dependable food supply. The United Nations' Relief and Works Agency estimates that the recent fighting added more than 330,000 new refugees to the pre-war total of one and a quarter million refugees then in the area.

Ever since the inception of the United Nations, the United States has stood ready to aid that organization in its efforts to relieve the suffering of refugees from wars, political strife, and natural

disaster. The United States has contributed substantially to refugee assistance programs to help displaced persons from many countries including India, French Indo-China, present-day Vietnam, Chile, Turkey, the Congo, China, Hungary, and East Germany. In my own area of south Florida the United States has contributed substantial assistance to aid refugees from Communist Cuba.

In addition, since the end of the Second World War, the United States has made some substantial contributions both through the United Nations and unilaterally to aid tremendous numbers of refugees throughout the Middle East area. Following the end of hostilities in the Middle East last June, the United States immediately took steps to provide assistance to hundreds of thousands of new refugees in that area. I am sure that many in the House of Representatives are interested in the tremendous effort which this country is making in that area of the world, and for that reason, I quote the text of a note from the U.S. Mission to the United Nations to the U.N. Secretary General which was made public on August 30, 1967:

The Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations presents his compliments to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and has the honor to reply to his note of July 10, 1967 drawing attention to operative paragraphs 8 and 9 of General Assembly resolution 2252 (ES-V) dealing with humanitarian assistance and requesting information on the measures taken by the United States Government in the light of this resolution.

The United States Government responded immediately to the basic needs of the persons displaced by the recent conflict by airlifting an initial 5,000 tents to Jordan to provide temporary shelter for the homeless. In addition, the United States has airlifted to Jordan 5,000 more tents and offered blankets, household utensils and stoves to help relieve the hardships in the area. The offer of blankets and household utensils have not yet been accepted and these items have not yet been furnished. The total cost of the tents and other items and their transport to Jordan by air is estimated at approximately \$1,675,000.

It will be recalled that the United States pledged for the support of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency a contribution of \$22.2 million for the year ended June 30, 1967. The pledge included \$13.3 million in cash and \$8.9 million in foodstuffs. At the time of the outbreak of hostilities in the Middle East, the last shipments of these foodstuffs were on the high seas enroute to the Middle East. In some cases vessels were forced to discharge their cargo in Mediterranean ports because of the inaccessibility of Middle East ports. The United States Government arranged for the onward transportation of these cargoes destined for use by UNRWA and bore the extra costs of storage in transit and trans-shipment.

As the Representative informed the Secretary-General in his letter of June 29, 1967, the United States made a special contribution of \$2 million in cash to UNRWA to help meet the emergency needs of victims of the conflict. Subsequently, the United States informed the Commissioner-General of UNRWA that it would provide 24,000 metric tons of wheat flour and 1,200 tons of vegetable oils for use in UNRWA's relief services during the next several months. The world market value of these commodities, including transportation to Middle Eastern ports, amounts to approximately \$4,284,000. The United States Government expects shortly

to make a second allocation of commodities to UNRWA of about the same magnitude.

In late June, the United States Government transmitted \$100,000 to the American Red Cross for contribution to the International Committee of the Red Cross for the latter organization's activities on behalf of the victims of the recent hostilities.

The United States Government also provided funds estimated at \$40,000 for the shipment, by air, to the Middle East of medical supplies (antibiotics and vitamins) donated by the American Red Cross to the International Committee of the Red Cross.

The United States Government is also continuing to donate, at rates prevailing prior to the outbreak of hostilities, foodstuffs to American voluntary agencies for their programs of assistance to needy persons in the Gaza Strip and on the West Bank. The value of such commodities at world market prices, exclusive of transportation cost, is approximately \$1,779,000 annually.

The United States is keeping the emergency needs of those persons affected by the recent hostilities under constant review and will cooperate fully with intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations now at work in the area as well as with the governments directly concerned.

THE JOHNSON ADMINISTRATION'S ACHIEVEMENTS FOR URBAN AMERICA VERSUS THE REPUBLICAN VOTING RECORD

(Mr. ANNUNZIO (at the request of Mr. PRYOR) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, in each of the four messages on the cities he has submitted to Congress during the past 4 years, President Johnson has warned that we cannot become two people—the suburban rich and the urban poor.

He urged us to begin planning and building today to keep pace with an urban population that will double in the next 40 years; and he emphasized that while we do not possess all of the answers to urban problems, we must move quickly "to make right what has taken generations to make wrong."

I would remind my colleagues that when Lyndon Johnson assumed office 3½ years ago, efforts in the poverty program were sporadic, unorganized, and undernourished. Since that time, the Johnson administration's efforts in the war on poverty have steadily mounted.

This year alone we are spending over \$25 billion on jobs, health, education, housing, and other urgent programs for the poor.

The record will show that 2 million Americans, as a direct result of these Government programs, have been moved over the poverty line.

Four million slum dwellers have obtained needed assistance from neighborhood centers.

Four million older Americans have received hospital care under the social security amendments—in 1 year alone.

In short, during its first 2 years, the war on poverty has benefited more than 9 million Americans. And this is just the beginning.

In addition, nearly 1 million Americans have participated in the Manpower Development and Training Act programs

October 3, 1967

to develop new skills that leads to new job opportunities.

There was no such program under the last Republican administration. There was no poverty program either. And there is simply no comparison over the efforts made by the Republicans to help our cities with that of the Kennedy and Johnson years.

Those Republicans who are now charging that this administration is reneging on its commitment to the urban poor have obviously neither consulted the record nor conferred with their colleagues in the House.

The record is clear: No administration in American history has created more sound and effective programs for the cities than has the Johnson administration.

And the record will show that the Republicans in the House have voted overwhelmingly against each and every one of these proposals.

Just in this session, the Republicans in the House have voted to eliminate all funds sought for continuing the rent supplements program. They have voted to reduce by two-thirds the funds requested for model cities. And it has cut by \$5 million the President's request for research in urban technology.

This is the party now criticizing the President for not doing enough? The American people must be forgiven if they are slightly incredulous.

All told, some 30 legislative proposals for the urban poor have been enacted by Congress over the past 3½ years. All of them have been strongly opposed by the House Republicans.

This is the record. And those Republicans seeking political advantage from the tragic events of this summer cannot be allowed to bury the bones of their party's dismal voting record on the cities in the Democratic backyard.

At this very moment, Congress has under consideration 14 pieces of major legislation to help our cities build a brighter future.

Let us see how the Republicans in Congress will vote on these measures. Let us measure the degree of Republican support in the House against some of the criticisms voiced by a few Republican Senators that the administration is not doing enough. I think the evidence will be conclusive about which party is the foe for urban America and which is the haven for the perennial obstructionists.

If the Republican Party wants to pose as the city dwellers best friend, let them match their voting record with their alleged commitment.

In the meantime, Lyndon Johnson's record of achievement to help the American city remains unmatched and unrivaled by any group or faction.

The record speaks louder than any political words.

ANOTHER ESCALATION BY REAGAN

(Mr. RESNICK (at the request of Mr. Pryor) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, Governor Reagan is at it again. Instead of concentrating on the problems of his State and his own administration, the "fastest gun in the West" is hysterically trying to set foreign policy from Sacramento.

In his latest, scenario, the hair trigger Governor, after threatening to use nuclear weapons to bring about a final solution to the Vietnamese war, tells us he favors expanding the war with an American invasion of North Vietnam, if only the military will give the green light.

Governor Reagan acts upon impulse while reasoned men recognize the dangers of a wider war. The Governor acts from frustration, while calmer men realize President Johnson is attempting to achieve a just solution without irrationally provoking Chinese entrance into the war. Mr. Reagan acts from ignorance of, or indifference to, our basic foreign policy goal—not to destroy North Vietnam and provoke world war III, but simply to insure the independence of South Vietnam.

The Governor should stop making rash and irresponsible foreign policy statements and content himself with bailing out his own ship in California. The last thing we need are policies which would blow us all back to "Death Valley Days."

HOW GIANT CO-OPS PRESSURE TAXPAYING BUSINESSES

(Mr. RESNICK (at the request of Mr. Pryor) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, during my ad hoc hearings into the activities of farm organizations, testimony was presented by a number of people which shed light on the business activities of farm organizations. Many of these businesses operate as tax-exempt cooperatives and, over the years, have undergone tremendous expansions into new fields—fields which are only partially related to agriculture. The regulations under which these tax-exempt cooperatives operate gives them a great advantage over the private taxpaying businesses that they compete with, and is putting them under tremendous economic pressure. Many are being driven out of business.

On August 31, Mr. Frank Silkebaken, an independent oil jobber from Iowa, delivered testimony which provided an illuminating insight into the problems that the expansion-minded cooperatives are creating for independent businessmen. Under unanimous consent, I present at this time the statement of Mr. Silkebaken:

STATEMENT OF FRANK M. SILKEBAKEN, BELLE PLAINE OIL CO., BELLE PLAINE, IOWA

Mr. RESNICK. These hearings will now come to order.

We will hear from Mr. Silkebaken.

Is there anybody with you that you would like to identify as being here with you?

Mr. SILKEBAKEN. Yes. I refer to a gentleman, a fellow Iowan, E. F. Bock from Garner, Iowa. I also have with me representatives of the National Oil Jobbers Council here in Washington, Mr. Wilfred H. Hall and Mr. Charles Hartman. I have as a personal guest of mine my son, Dennis.

Mr. RESNICK. Thank you.

Mr. SILKEBAKEN. Good afternoon, gentle-

men. My name is Frank M. Silkebaken, and I am an independent oil jobber from Belle Plaine, Iowa. I am here representing the 700 independent oil jobbers in Iowa, under the auspices of the Iowa Independent Oil Jobbers Association. As oil jobbers we are wholesale distributors of gasoline, heating oil, other petroleum products, and tires, batteries and accessories to various businesses and retail customers within our State. With me today is another Iowa oil jobber, Mr. Ed Bock, who is a past president of our Iowa association.

Mr. RESNICK. What is your position with the Iowa Independent Oil Jobbers Association?

Mr. SILKEBAKEN. I am a member, sir.

Mr. RESNICK. You are officially representing them?

Mr. SILKEBAKEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. RESNICK. Please proceed.

Mr. SILKEBAKEN. This testimony is made in the context of today's needs by the Federal Government to collect additional tax revenues. Our President has suggested a 10 per cent surtax on individuals and corporations' income taxes this year. We feel strongly that if the Government needs additional revenue to finance its programs, it should first explore our contention that cooperatives who have outgrown the reasons for their initial tax-free status should be taxed at the same rate as those businesses with whom they regularly compete.

The total amount of revenues that could be realized by taxing these cooperative corporations like other corporations are taxed is probably over \$100 million a year. Thus, we suggest there is a double-barreled reason for consideration of this problem by the Congress at this time, the first being to provide needed tax revenues and the second to bring much needed equity to the marketplace in order to restore a more fair measure of competition between those engaged in the marketing of non-farm produced products.

The tax-exempt status for cooperatives was originally designed to assist business units composed of farmers themselves, aimed principally at allowing them to buy feed, fertilizer and farm implements at terms and under conditions which would bring benefits to them.

The first income tax Act in 1913 granted tax exemptions to certain organizations, including agricultural groups, and at that time the number of small farms in the United States and the amount of product they produced made such a plan appear equitable. However, we have now witnessed a reduction in the number of farms in this country and the centralization of production into ever larger agricultural business units. Thus, the farmers, like other types of businesses, have had to grow in size.

Heavy reliance on farm implements have of course helped to create the situation where the farmer must be full-sized to afford the hardware necessary to operate today. The successful farmer, therefore, is one who runs a fairly large farm and is one who has a substantial investment in land and can not be compared except by profession with his counterpart in 1913.

With the decline in the number of small farms in the Nation, the cooperatives' originally envisioned role was discarded in favor of entering into the sale of nonagricultural materials. This has extended to the point where a visit to many of the local cooperatives can be likened to going to a hardware store, a service station or even a supermarket, rather than to a grain and feed dealer. This has been occasioned by the fact that the farm itself has changed from one which was essentially a relatively small unit into being a fairly large landholding business operation. The exempt cooperative at that point should have been phased out of operation since its need was evaporating. However, at this time they have altered their operations into non-agricultural items and now compete with a host of other businesses.

Bring new job training opportunities in existing plants to the hard core unemployed. Create new jobs and new training opportunities for the seriously disadvantaged in plants which will be established in or near areas of concentrated unemployment.

Encourage new enterprises combining the resources of big and small businesses to provide jobs and job training opportunities for the disadvantaged.

To initiate this effort, the resources of the Department of Commerce, Defense, Labor, Health, Education and Welfare, and Housing and Urban Development, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the General Services Administration and the Small Business Administration will be combined to provide maximum assistance and to minimize the added cost of these in private industry willing to assume responsibility for providing training and work opportunities for the seriously disadvantaged.

Initially, nearly \$40 million from a wide variety of existing programs will be made available, as will millions of dollars worth of surplus Federal property and excess Federal equipment.

We will offer to private industry:

A full spectrum of aid to assist them in recruiting, counselling, training, and providing health and other needed services to the disadvantaged.

Aid which will enable them to experiment with new ways to overcome the transportation barriers now separating men and women from jobs.

Surplus Federal land, technical assistance and funds to facilitate the construction of new plants in or near areas of concentrated unemployment.

Excess Federal equipment to enable them to train more disadvantaged people.

Assistance to joint enterprises combining the resources of big and small businesses to bring jobs and training opportunities to the disadvantaged.

I have asked the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Labor to direct this test program and insure that all available Federal resources are utilized. The Secretary of Commerce will designate a full-time Special Representative as the single point of contact for private employers participating in this project. The Special Representative will provide employers with one-stop service for the entire Federal Government and will make whatever arrangements are appropriate with the various Federal agencies for all forms of Federal assistance.

The Secretary of Labor will designate a full-time officer in the Manpower Administration to work with the Special Representative of the Secretary of Commerce in connection with the training and employment elements of these projects.

I have also asked the Secretaries of Defense, Health, Education and Welfare, and Housing and Urban Development, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Administrators of the General Services Administration and the Small Business Administration to assist the Secretaries of Commerce and Labor in this test program and to assign a single official in their agencies who will coordinate their efforts in support of this program.

Provision will be made for continuing liaison with local projects and for careful research and evaluation to crystallize field experience into guidelines for future action.

I have asked the Secretary of Commerce to invite corporations throughout the country to join this new effort to bring meaningful employment to disadvantaged citizens both in existing plants and, where feasible, in new locations near areas of concentrated unemployment.

I have directed each Department and Agency of this Government to give top priority to all phases of this important effort.

The Real Danger in the Middle East: Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the Chinese Communists are now moving into the Middle East and picking up the promises abrogated by the refusal of the Soviet Union to engage in actual hostilities against Israel. Whether China will ever really come to the aid of the Arabs in any renewed warfare is, of course, unknown.

Certainly, however, the leaders of the shaky Arab governments would be well advised to avoid the enticing words of Peking and investigate what has happened to other governments who fell for Chinese propaganda.

The following editorial from the September 15, 1967, edition of the Jewish Press recalls some of those governments and I commend it to the attention of our colleagues:

THE UNHOLY ALLIANCE

The Chinese Communists have completed an alliance with the Arabs at a recent meeting in Peking.

Mao has lulled the extremist Arabs into his camp. He has further pledged to join them in destroying Israel.

But this was to be expected. China's involvement all over the world is no secret.

Russia trusts China as far as she can throw her! Red China has an unblemished record of double and triple crossing everyone she has ever dealt with including Russia.

Prince Nordom Sihanouk of Cambodia followed the demands of the Red Chinese to the letter. He kicked out the Americans, spurned U.S. aid, opened his ports to the Viet Cong, and gave comfort and supplies to the Chinese guerrillas. He was a perfect host to Red China because he felt he would obtain an immunity from Communist invasion.

HE GUESSED WRONG

But he guessed wrong! Today the communists are tightening their strangle hold on Cambodia. They have been successful in forcing out Cambodia's Prime Minister and other anti-communist leaders and as a result Cambodia is now at Red China's mercy.

The case of India's Nehru isn't much different. Nehru did everything to curry favor with Peking. When his work was completed the Communists thanked him with an invasion in 1962.

How about Indonesia's ousted President Sukarno who just about sold out his country to become a communist puppet. He too, felt he was gaining an immunity from communist invasion. But little did Sukarno know, that recently discovered communist documents show he was slated for execution as soon as Mao took over.

OTHER NATIONS BETRAYED

What happened in Laos when Prince Souvanna Phouma tried to keep neutral? He saw the communist menace and sought an immunity by innocently recognizing the pro-communist forces in his government. He got a jolt when the communists stepped up their drive to take over Laos.

The case of Burma is no different. Burma had attempted to placate the Communists and threw out Americans, trying to win favor with Peking. So what happened? Burma has

now become the chief target of radio Peking and radio Hanoi as an "imperialist" nation. Her days as a republic appear numbered!

The Buddhists, too, made a deal with the Communists to obtain immunity. Yet, thousands of Buddhists have been tortured and murdered in Tibet.

That is the history of the Red Chinese reliability.

ARABS TURN TO MAO

Now it is the Arabs turn. The extremist Arab groups are holding conferences with Mao's Peking government. As usual, Mao has given "his word" to the Arabs that he will not rest until Israel is annihilated.

Interpreting this effort in terms of past experiences we must assume that Red China will be taking over a major part of the Middle East, without firing a shot.

Russia is seriously concerned because she knows the present Arab regimes are weak and can topple at the drop of a hat. In fact, Russia has slowed down her delivery of supplies to Nasser in recent weeks for that very reason.

Russia recognizes the Red Chinese danger in the Middle East. But does the United States?

Israel is the only country able to sustain a non-communist government in the Middle East and should be given all-out aid immediately! Instead, our State Department is conjuring up ways to impede Israel at every turn.

We appeal to President Johnson to recognize the real danger in the Middle East, Red China.

Israel needs economic aid, and military help. If war flares again in the Middle East, Israel will really be the Free World's first line of defense against communism.

Railway Labor Urges Tax Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1967

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, on August 16, 1967, I suggested nine tax loopholes which, if closed, would provide additional revenue to the Treasury of at least \$4 billion a year—roughly equal to the \$4.3 of additional revenue to be raised by the President's proposed 10 percent surcharge on individual taxpayers.

In the month and a half since, I have heard from a number of individuals and organizations who favor tax reform to reduce the inequities in our present tax system. The following statement by the Railway Labor Executives' Association is indicative of the widespread interest in tax reform:

STATEMENT BY THE RAILWAY LABOR EXECUTIVES' ASSOCIATION

With the federal budget deficit for the present fiscal year now estimated as high as \$29 billion, largely due to the war in Vietnam, it is clear that the government needs additional revenues. However, we do not believe that the moderate-income group who now are experiencing a difficult time making both ends meet should be forced to bear an additional tax burden.

Instead of adding to the tax burdens of most working people and other moderate-income families, the government should begin now to tax the tens of billions of dollars

that escape the income tax system entirely each year through tax loopholes used by the big corporations and the wealthy.

These loopholes—and especially the “capital gains” tax gimmick—explain why in 1965, the latest year for which figures are available, 22 of the 646 taxpayers reporting an income of \$1 million or more paid no income tax whatever. The remaining 624 of these immensely rich Americans paid less than 30 per cent of their income in taxes, even though the tax rate for all taxable income over \$100,000 is 70 per cent.

These loopholes—and especially the “depletion allowance” gimmick—explain why in 1966 the 20 largest oil companies paid corporate income taxes at a rate of 6.3 per cent, instead of the standard rate for large corporations of 48 per cent.

Nearly eight years ago, Rep. Wilbur Mills, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, wrote (in Life magazine for November 23, 1959): “If we kept the \$600 personal exemption but taxed all other income, we could reduce the individual income tax rates by about 40 per cent and still raise just as much money.” Instead Mills pointed out, “we have a tax system riddled with preferential benefits.”

In the years since 1959, Congress has done virtually nothing to close the loopholes and tax the untaxed incomes. In fact, the latest tax action by Congress was restoration of the “investment credit” tax advantage to the corporations on an even more favorable basis than before—at a cost to the Treasury of \$2 billion a year. Meeting the burdens of the Vietnam war—both human and financial—should be based on equality of sacrifice. Instead, these burdens have fallen most heavily on the nation's working people and other moderate-income families.

These are the families whose sons and brothers fight the war.

These are the families who see the cost of living, month by month, bite ever more deeply into their modest incomes.

These are the families who see corporation profits after taxes rise by 75 per cent between 1930 and the first half of 1967, while the average worker's take-home pay after taxes rises only 24 per cent in the same period.

These are the families who in many cases face another increase in Social Security payments next year, and who must pay the constantly rising state and local taxes.

These are the families—in the case of railroad workers—who see the President and Congress using the Vietnam war as an excuse to outlaw their right to strike, so as to hold down their wages.

These are the families who see the government doing absolutely nothing about the latest round of price increases by the big corporations on steel, chemicals, tires, aluminum, vinyl flooring, shoe materials, building materials, trucks and textiles.

Nearly a year ago, on September 14, 1966, the Railway Labor Executives' Association called on the President and Congress to strike at inflation by ending the big tax loopholes and inequities, by imposing a special anti-inflation tax on the corporations that fail to hold the price line, and by other measures.

Such a program is even more urgent today than a year ago. Rep. Henry Reuss has proposed a modest attack on the “capital gains” tax gimmick, the “depletion allowance” gimmick and seven other tax loopholes—which would raise \$4 billion a year for the Treasury, or nearly as much as the President's proposed 10 per cent surcharge on individual incomes.

This, in our view, is the right approach. Few taxes needed for the Vietnam war should be collected primarily by taxing the income that now goes untaxed or undertaxed—not by increasing taxes on millions of American working families.

Ways to Vietnam Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1967

Mr. BINGHAM. I should like to commend to the attention of my colleagues and other readers of the Record the following splendid editorial which appears in today's New York Times:

WAYS TO VIETNAM PEACE

The appeals of a half-dozen foreign ministers at the General Assembly for a halt in the bombing of North Vietnam reflect a general consensus in the world organization that President Johnson came close to recognizing in his latest statement on the subject.

Not all countries are prepared to criticize American policy publicly, of course. But in the corridors, among the closest allies of the United States—and even among countries which support American objectives and policy in Vietnam—there is overwhelming agreement that the bombing is a failure, that it blocks effective probing for peace and that a cessation without a time limit would be in the American and world interest.

There is strong reason to believe that an opening of negotiations would follow an unconditional—or indefinite—cessation of the bombing in three or four weeks. Whether Hanoi's statement that talks “could” follow means the same as Moscow's assertion that talks “would” take place is a question that most other countries believe has been adequately answered by the whole Communist bloc. If talks did not begin after several weeks' bombing suspension, the United States would be in a strong position in world opinion to step up the war.

The appeal of Foreign Minister Malik of Indonesia is of particular interest because of the effort repeatedly made by Washington to claim that American intervention in Vietnam saved Indonesia from Communism. Mr. Malik, one of those who really did the saving, obviously feels Indonesia's interest and those of Asia as a whole would be best served by a political accommodation in Vietnam, rather than continuation of the war.

The peace plan put forward by Canada is of importance because of Canadian contact with Hanoi as a member of the International Control Commission set up in Vietnam by the Geneva accords. External Affairs Secretary Martin has been advancing his four-stage solution since April without any criticism by Hanoi. Several ingenious elements in it make it worthy of a favorable American response.

While Mr. Martin described a halt in the bombing as the “first priority,” he included in the first stage of his plan an important gesture of North Vietnamese de-escalation, yet the one that would be easiest for Hanoi to make—a cease-fire or pull-back from the demilitarized zone.

The remaining stages—which would first freeze forces, then achieve a cease-fire and finally lead to the withdrawal of all external forces from South Vietnam—would obviously have to be accompanied by negotiation of a political settlement. But the advance commitment to withdraw American and North Vietnamese forces in this sequence is what might make successful negotiations possible.

There are many paths toward peace in Vietnam. But most important is the first step toward the conference table. A halt in the bombing is the essential prerequisite.

Veterans' Story: Superbly Told

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 1967

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Veterans Affairs Committee, I have had occasion to observe closely the operation of the Veterans' Administration for almost 20 years.

The story of the American veteran reaches from the neglected days following the war for independence to the founding of a great Federal agency in 1930 specifically to meet the needs of veterans.

Mr. Speaker, that story has now been told in a monumental effort by Robinson E. Adkins, who has been part of the Veterans' Administration since its earliest days. His work, entitled “Medical Care of Veterans,” reveals the trials, errors and dedicated service of the men and women associated with the Veterans' Administration. In his book, Mr. Adkins vividly describes the valuable contributions the Veterans' hospitals have made to medical science.

In a recent issue of the Jersey Journal of Jersey City, N.J., this superb book was reviewed by our distinguished former colleague Alfred Sieminski. Mr. Sieminski, a Member of this House for 8 years, looks at this new book with a knowledgeable and critical eye.

I commend this excellent history of the American veteran, and the splendid review by Mr. Sieminski which follows, to the attention of the Members of the House and to the people of our country.

ADKINS GREAT IN “MEDICAL CARE STORY”

“Medical Care of Veterans,” by Robinson E. Adkins, U.S. Government Printing Office, 411 pp., paper, \$1.35.

(The following is a guest review compiled by Alfred Sieminski, former U.S. congressman from the 13th district, based on material supplied by Dr. H. Blacker Weinberg, of Washington, D.C., and Muriel McKenna, of Arlington, Va.)

“To care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphan”—those compassionate words from Lincoln's second inaugural address are proudly announced on a blue plaque to anyone passing or entering the Veterans' Administration building in Washington, D.C. It is the mission of the agency.

Robinson E. Adkins, the main compiler of this study of the medical care of veterans, has been part of that mission since the earliest days of the agency.

This publication documents the medical care of veterans from the earliest days of our country to the founding of the V.A. in 1930. It reviews the history of the Department of Medicine and Surgery from its beginning to its present operation under William J. Driver, administrator, and Dr. H. Martin Engle, chief medical director.

The establishment of the Veterans Administration enabled the veteran to have a single point of contact. He could turn to any office or hospital within the V.A. for any benefit to which he was entitled.

This is a far cry from early days in England when a veteran, in appreciation, was